Exhibit F

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 3 4 IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation,) MD 15-02641-PHX-DGC 5 6 Lisa Hyde and Mark Hyde, a married) Phoenix, Arizona 7 couple,) September 18, 2018 Plaintiffs, 8 9) CV 16-00893-PHX-DGC v. 10 C.R. Bard, Inc., a New Jersey corporation, and Bard Peripheral Vascular, an Arizona corporation, 11 12 Defendants. 1.3 14 15 BEFORE: THE HONORABLE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, JUDGE 16 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 17 TRIAL DAY 1 - A.M. SESSION 18 19 20 21 Official Court Reporter: Patricia Lyons, RMR, CRR Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Ste. 312 2.2. 401 West Washington Street, SPC 41 23 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2150 (602) 322-7257 24 Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter 25 Transcript Prepared with Computer-Aided Transcription

23

24

08:34:40 25

motions. And I thought you agreed that McMeeking can testify along those lines.

In terms of what he would say for a particular patient, he is not going to come in and say that the Simon Nitinol filter was appropriate for Lisa Hyde, and I wouldn't ask him that.

He has said in his case-specific report that the Bard G2X filter is improperly and inadequately designed such that it does not prevent tilt, caudal migration, fracture and perforation, as it lacks adequate safeguards against these failure modes to a reasonable degree of scientific and engineering probability and certainty. The failures of Ms. Hyde's filter resulted from poor design, inadequate testing prior to marketing the filter, and implantation of the filter — and implantation — prior to implantation of the filter in Mrs. Hyde, and improper internal assessment of the filter via analysis, including finite analysis and other methods of analysis utilized by Bard.

So I believe that sums his opinions in this case and where he's going to go.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Helm, do you have a problem with what Mr. O'Connor just read as an opinion to be stated?

MS. HELM: Your Honor, those opinions, to use a term I've heard you say before, are all fair game. My objection

Case 2:15-md-02641-DGC Document 15752-6 Filed 03/04/19 Page 4 of 8

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT'D) - ROBERT McMEEKING

11:29:46 1 MS. HELM: Nowhere in his reports has he offered an 2 alternative design as a two-tier design. He's said that the 3 Simon Nitinol is an alternative design, but he's now 4 testifying to a filter like the Simon Nitinol. 11:29:59 5 When I raised this with Mr. O'Connor before we started today, he said he wasn't going to offer that opinion. 6 7 So --8 MR. O'CONNOR: He's going to talk about his opinions 9 on caudal anchors, he's going to talk about his opinions on the chamfer, and he's going to talk about his opinions on 11:30:12 10 11 perforation limiters. All listed and set forth in his report. 12 THE COURT: Well, he just talked about a two-tier design. Is that in his report? 13 14 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. THE COURT: Can you show it to me? 11:30:25 15 MR. O'CONNOR: Do we have --16 17 It's a repeat of what he said on Simon Nitinol. THE COURT: He didn't talk about Simon Nitinol. 18 said a two-tiered design would be an improvement. 19 11:30:37 20 MR. O'CONNOR: That's what he's referring to. 21 THE COURT: Then I think he should clarify he's 22 talking about the Simon Nitinol. 23 MR. O'CONNOR: Then I'm going to have talk about 24 caudal anchors, the chamfer, and the perforation limiters.

THE COURT: All right. If he clarifies the two-tier

11:30:48 25

```
DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT'D) - ROBERT McMEEKING
              means the Simon Nitinol, that addresses your issue.
11:30:51
         1
          2
                        MS. HELM: As long as it's the Simon Nitinol.
          3
                        MR. O'CONNOR: That's fine.
                        THE COURT: Okay. So clarify that and you can move
          4
          5
               on.
11:30:59
                    (Bench conference concludes.)
          6
          7
                        THE COURT: Thank you.
          8
               BY MR. O'CONNOR:
                   Dr. McMeeking, I just wanted to talk about -- clarify
               something for everybody here and the members of the jury.
11:31:15 10
         11
                        The two-tier design is what you talked about when you
         12
               talked about the Simon Nitinol filter is a safer filter.
                   That's correct.
         13
               Α
                   All right. Now, what about caudal anchors? Did you
         14
11:31:28 15
               report on those?
         16
                   I did.
               Α
         17
                   What are caudal anchors?
                  Caudal anchors are features on the filter.
         18
               Α
                        May I have the Elmo on again, please.
         19
11:31:47 20
                        Again, if you look at the Eclipse filter, you can see
        21
               at the left end where we have the feet on the legs there are
        22
               hooks. These hooks are designed to hook into the wall of the
         23
               vena cava and that will help to stop the filter moving in this
         24
              direction. Because to move in this direction, you have to
11:32:09 25
              work against the shape of the hooks.
```


DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT'D) - ROBERT McMEEKING

Caudal anchors are hooks that point in the opposite direction, so that if the filter wants to move that way, the hooks will inhibit that motion.

- Q All right. And that would, in your opinion, reduce or prevent which failure mode?
- A It would reduce and help to eliminate the failure mode of caudal migration, and it would reduce and help to eliminate the fault of tilting. Because when the filter tilts, it needs to move some of its limbs in the caudal direction, even if some of the limbs go in the upwards direction. It's called cephalic. Cephalic, caudal.

So the caudal anchors will help to inhibit tilt as well as caudal migration. And since tilt contributes to perforation, that will help to reduce the degree of perforation. And since perforation contributes to fatigue fracture, that will help to reduce the incidence of fatigue fracture.

- Q Now, you also talked about the chamfer.
- A Correct. Correct.

11:32:12

11:32:27

11:32:52 10

11:33:15 15

11:33:33 20

11:33:55 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

- Q And what, in your opinion, should be done to the chamfer to make it safer?
- A The chamfer should be made gentler.
- Q That's the edge of the cap?
 - A Edge of the cap. I'll show this illustration again.

The situation in the filters that we're discussing is

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT'D) - ROBERT McMEEKING

like that. But as making it like that would be a much better situation, a much safer situation, and would help to reduce the incidences of fatigue failures that would be experienced by the filter.

And a point to make is that the Simon Nitinol filter has such a feature in its cap. Where the top wires come out of the top cap there is a breaking of the edge that has the same effect as I'm talking about with this gentler rounding of the surface.

- Q And then in terms of penetration limiters, what is your opinion on those?
- A My opinion on penetration limiters is that they would help because they would help to reduce how much perforation and penetration was taking place in the filter. And that would contribute to reduction in the problems the filters have with fatigue fracture because fatigue fracture is a consequence often of perforation. And because perforation contributes to tilt, it would have contributed to reducing how much tilt the filters were experiencing as well.
- Q Dr. McMeeking, you told us earlier that the G2, the G2X, like the Recovery, and the Eclipse were marketed as permanent filters; correct?
- A That's correct.

11:33:58

11:34:14

11:34:41 10

11:35:00 15

11:35:26 20

11:35:48 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Q Do you have an opinion whether the design flaws that you have determined exist in each of those filters, defective

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT'D) - ROBERT McMEEKING 11:35:53 1 designs, were consistent with a filter that should be stable 2 and remain in a patient's vena cava for the duration of her 3 life? It is my opinion these features of the filter are inconsistent with that objective. 11:36:05 6 And based upon the design, should Bard have known these 7 filters could fail at any time after implant? 8 Yes. Α 9 Now, we talked about your opinions and your findings and your calculations; correct? 11:36:28 10 11 Α Correct. 12 And those opinions support what, in your mind, are 13 defective designs in this filter? That's correct. 14 Α And in your opinion, the defective design of the filter, 11:36:38 15 16 the G2, G2X, the Eclipse, the filter that Lisa Hyde 17 experienced, did those failures result from the defective design? 18 They do. 19 Α 11:36:52 20 And do you attribute her failures that she experienced in 21 her filter, the penetration and the fracture, to the 22 inadequate testing that was done by Bard? 23 Α I do. 24 And is the failures that Lisa Hyde's filter experienced,

contribute those to the improper internal assessments that

11:37:05 25